DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 929 JC 980 425

AUTHOR	Dillon, Timothy J.
TITLE	Writing Across the Curriculum: Annual Report, 1997-98.
INSTITUTION	Monroe County Community Coll., MI.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	65p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Learning; *Peer Teaching; Program Effectiveness; Surveys; Teacher Student Relationship; Two Year Colleges; *Writing Across the Curriculum; *Writing Instruction; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Monroe County Community College MI

ABSTRACT

This report provides outcomes for the 1997-98 Monroe Community College's Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program, an effort designed to help students learn to write in all disciplines with the help of writing centers staffed by trained student writing fellows. The program focuses on improving the quality of services through renewed efforts to communicate with faculty and students. Strategies employed to provide better service for a diverse student body included the Writing Center Assignment Book, written reports submitted by tutors, writing fellow volunteerism, and an Exchange Day that provided facility tours. A campus-wide survey of students and faculty was administered to determine effectiveness in the areas of service and communications. Following introductory remarks, the report includes the following sections: the year in review; a self-evaluation study from faculty and students; 1997-98 writing fellows scheduling and statistics; WAC program evaluations by students, writing fellows and faculty; and a budget report. The report also includes a discussion of schedules and a statistical analysis of the work that goes on in the Writing Center. Appended is a survey for the Institutional Project Grant: A Report on Research into Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Projects (1987). (AS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 929

Monroe County Community College

Writing Across the Curriculum Annual Report 1997-1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. J. Dillon
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Compiled and Written
by
Timothy J. Dillon

Humanities/Social Sciences Division

JC 980 425

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Writing Across the Curriculum Annual Report 1997-1998
Written by Timothy J. Dillon, Writing Across the Curriculum Program Coordinator
June, 1998

Monroe County Community College Humanities Division
William E. McCloskey Ph.D., Humanities Division Chair

Desktop Publishing:
Timothy J. Dillon

Printing Courtesy of:
Monroe County Community College Graphic Arts Department

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

I. Introductory Remarks: 1997-98 Annual Report 1

II. The Year in Review 2

III. Self Evaluation Study 5

A. Faculty 5

B. Students 12

IV. 1997-98 Writing Fellows 17

V. Scheduling 20

VI. Statistics 27

VII. WAC Program Evaluation by Students 32

VIII. WAC Evaluation by Writing Fellows 42

IX. WAC Evaluation by Faculty 46

X. Budget Report 50

XI. Appendix 51

Introductory Remarks: 1997-1998 Annual Report

Writing Across the Curriculum: Monroe County Community College

For the last two years the MCCC Writing-Across-the-Curriculum program has been committed to improvement. As stated in last year's report, we focused on improving the quality of our services in 1996-1997 through renewed efforts in training, new strategies in program administration, and increased efforts to communicate with faculty and students. In 1997-1998 we thought it was time to gauge our progress and see how we were doing. To that end, we decided to conduct a campus-wide survey of students and faculty, to determine our effectiveness in the areas of service and communications. In addition, we continued to monitor our daily activities, count the number of conferences we conducted, and collect evaluations from faculty and students who participate in WAC. In short summary, we think we had a good year of growth and development, and our evaluations and surveys support that conclusion. We also learned, however, that there are areas of concern we need to address—some have been ongoing problems, but others we had not recognized until we looked at the survey results.

For the fourth consecutive year we surpassed 2,000 conferences, and we are proud of this accomplishment—a result of our continued efforts to reach out to students and faculty through advertising, class-room contacts, information booths, and fellowed courses. Yet, we wanted to know more than just the number of students we conferenced. We decided to survey a broad cross-section of faculty and students in hope of finding out what they knew about our program, and how they thought we were doing. While our yearly statistics indicate that those who use our program are very satisfied, we also wanted to know why some faculty and students do not choose to use our services. In addition, we thought that we might persuade the non-users to suggest ways that we might change their minds.

This survey was somewhat prompted by our ten-year anniversary, and the first half of the report (faculty survey) is a mirror of John Holladay's Institutional Project Survey from 1987. We thought it might be interesting to compare some of the results. The second half of the survey was created by several Writing Fellows who volunteered time to write the survey, distribute it, and record the data. We plan to repeat the survey every few years. The survey results and a discussion of what it all might mean is included in this report.

In addition, you will find in this report the annual recognition of those who worked diligently to help students improve their writing skills—Writing Fellows. As in the past, they are a dedicated group of students who contribute greatly to the quality of this institution. Contiguously, we also recognize the faculty who were willing to give extra effort on their students' behalf. Also included in this report is a discussion of schedules; a statistical analysis of the work that goes on in the Writing Center; evaluations by student, faculty, and Writing Fellows who have participated in the program; and our annual budget.

Many of the Writing Fellows contributed to this report by laboring over report forms, collecting data, creating survey questions, and conducting surveys on Main and Whitman campuses. I could not have finished this work without them. So a grateful recognition goes out to all of them. All of the Writing Fellows contributed in some way to another successful year in WAC, and I think they would join me in hoping that many years of success lie ahead.

II. The Year in Review

The 1997-1998 academic year for the Writing-Across-the-Curriculum program had four objectives: maintain the quality of the program through continued services to faculty and students, maintain communications with students and faculty, continue to learn more about WAC through communications with other colleges and universities, and conduct a campus-wide student and faculty evaluation of our program in conjunction with our ten-year anniversary.

Meeting our first goal was a challenge because of the number of Writing Fellows we lost to graduation and transfer before and during the academic year. I will discuss in Section IV of this report why over half of our Writing Fellows had only one semester of experience. However, we believe we developed a competent staff of tutors, through training in 254 Composition and through the efforts of the Senior Writing Fellows who were willing to mentor trainees whenever needed. Our mentoring program assigns each Novice Writing Fellow a Senior Writing Fellow as a support person. The Senior Writing Fellow is available to answer questions about a range of problems, from tutoring to processing forms. This is important to the development of the Novice Writing Fellows, but also allows Senior Writing Fellows to review and teach the skills they have acquired.

As always, our first concern is to the service we provide for students and faculty. We have tried to maintain a triangle of communication between tutor and instructor, student and tutor, and student and instructor. One method we employ is to have each tutor meet with the instructor to discuss the writing assigned to the class. In addition, each tutor completes a written report explaining the assignments as understood by the tutor and gives the instructor a copy to check for accuracy. We have found that this process allows the instructor and tutor to forge a mutual understanding of the writing assignment, and encourages the tutor to completely understand the assignment and be able to translate the assignment into student language—this is an important skill they will need when conferencing students.

Many of the students who use the Writing Center, however, are not part of an assigned class--they are walk-ins or they have made an appointment on their own. So the reoccurring question for us is how to provide better services for them. One strategy we employed this year was the Writing Center Assignment Book. Instructors on campus were asked to send in a copy of their writing assignments, as distributed to students, so that we could put them on file. When students came to the Writing Center from that class, the tutor was able to go to the file, read the assignment sheet and better assist the student in following directions, and developing a complete piece of writing that addressed all aspects of the assignment. This program experienced some success. We had 27 instructors, full and part-time, use this service. We hope, however, that more instructors will take part in this program for 1998-1999. We will continue to offer this service and provide instructors with the means to update their assignment sheets on file. Research certainly indicates that tutors are better able to conferences students when they understand the assignment as designed by the instructor.

In pursuit of our second goal, maintaining communications with students and faculty, we continued several strategies that have proved successful. Several of the Writing Fellows volunteered time to work in the college information booth during the first week of classes. We passed out literature and answered questions about the program. After classes began, all of the Senior Writing Fellows selected

specific courses and asked permission of the instructors to present the WAC program to their students. Experience has shown these presentations to be very successful in introducing the WAC program to new students who would otherwise be unaware of our services. (This conclusion is also supported by our WAC survey in section III. B. of this report.) This also allows students to meet Writing Fellows, ask questions, and make plans for visits to the Writing Center. The classroom presentation program was repeated at the beginning of winter semester and we conducted over fifty presentations on Main Campus and the Whitman Center over the course of the year. We had hoped to find a way to provide classes with orientation sessions in the Writing Center, but with the configuration of space in the LAL, it would be disruptive for other tutors in the SI programs; therefore, we have focused more on communicating with students through other avenues.

To this end, we continue to place photos of the Writing Fellows in display cases in the Administration building and outside the Writing Center. Our purpose is to allow students to become familiar with the Writing Fellows before they seek conferences. We hope this face recognition alleviates some anxiety students may be experiencing as they seek help in the Writing Center. We also launched a poster campaign at the end of the year. These posters advertise our services, and they are placed around campus in hallways and in classrooms. As a group, we are continually trying to find new and innovative ways to communicate our services to students and faculty, and communication remains one of our primary goals.

To reach our third goal, we continued our efforts to communicate with WAC programs in other colleges and universities. In October, 1997 three Writing Fellows--Lisa Smith, Scott Houk, and Susan Vincelli--joined me in attending the annual Michigan Writing Centers Project Idea Days Conference held this year in Traverse City, Michigan. Some of the topics discussed at the conference included WAC-outreach programs to local high schools, incorporating technology into writing centers, as well as other issues concerning the administration of WAC programs and writing centers. The Writing Fellows were able to discuss tutoring issues with other tutors from several Michigan colleges, universities, and community colleges. They came away with new ideas, new perspectives, and renewed pride in the work they do. The students attending the conference discussed what they learned with the full body of MCCC Writing Fellows at our October meeting.

In February of 1998, we hosted the first Michigan Community College WAC Exchange Day. Because community colleges have unique goals and strategies, as well as challenges and problems, we thought it might benefit community college programs if we could exchange ideas and view the workings of other programs. We invited Schoolcraft Community College and Macomb Community College because we were familiar with their programs, and they had expressed interest in this type of exchange. Macomb Community College is slated as this year's host and we anticipate this program will continue yearly and include other community colleges in Michigan.

About 20 students and faculty from the two colleges attended Exchange Day and they all had an opportunity to tour our facilities, observe tutoring sessions, and critique our administrative procedures. We conducted three dialogue sessions on tutoring titled: "What Brings Students to a Writing Center and What Brings Them Back?" How Do We Resolve Student Expectations with Writing Fellow Expectations?" and "What Should We Be Sure to Address in Each Conference, and What Should We Avoid Addressing in Each Conference?"

Several Writing Fellows volunteered their time to participate in the Exchange Day. They were: Nichole Ball, Joy Sharkey, Hilary Little, Amy Collins, Susan Vincelli, Monica Peterson, Terri Celski, Pat LeBlanc, and Jackie Brancheau. Our Writing Fellows worked in groups and functioned as group leaders in tours of the

Writing Center and later as facilitators of discussions. The group discussions revealed to our students that other schools approach writing and tutoring in different ways. We had several lively discussion involving different ideas and approaches regarding each of these subjects. I think all of the tutors from all three colleges gained an appreciation for using different tutoring methods and dealing with the uniqueness of community college students.

Our fourth goal, conducting a campus-wide survey, was prompted by our ten-year anniversary. At the inception of the WAC program ten years ago, John Holladay conducted a campus-wide faculty survey to determine attitudes, perceptions, and expectations about writing. This year, we conducted a mirror survey, to compare to the original survey, so that we might document similarities and changes in faculty viewpoints. In addition, we decided to create a student survey to gain another perspective on how we are doing. In both cases, we think we gained some valuable information; however, we also learned from this experience and recognized a few mistakes we made in the process. Our successes and failures are further discussed in section III of this report in the analysis of both surveys.

In the past year we had four of our Writing Fellows selected as finalist in the Michigan Student Scholar Competition. These students are Kim Blaker, Susan Vincelli, Adam Poch, and Bonnie Berry. We are quite proud that our Writing Fellows are not only good tutors, but also have demonstrated their willingness to work toward becoming good writers. We have encouraged students to participate in the Student Scholars Competition through the Writing Center, and we have discussed how we might develop our own competition on campus as a feeder program to the SSC program. We will continue to address that question in 1998-1999.

In 1997-1998 we purchased two computers for the Writing Center. The first purpose for these computers is direct tutoring of writing. We have a budget to purchase software that will allow students to work through writing skills, review grammar, and solve common writing problems. In addition, Writing Fellows will be trained to use computers as they conference students. There are several tutoring strategies that work well with computers such as isolating specific text, moving text around in the paper, and selecting patterns of errors.

A second purpose for the computers is to use them in an on-line tutoring program. Students will be able to send their papers to the Writing Center in email format, and Writing Fellows will respond to the papers by commenting on specific problems and suggesting strategies for improvement. The on-line program will progress slowly so that we can determine problems that might arise. Email tutoring, while becoming common, has inherently unique problems that need to be resolved, or at least mitigated to some degree. Our efforts in this area for fall of 1998 will focus on developing email-tutoring policies and procedures. Our goal is to have this program available to students on a limited scale by winter semester of 1999.

Last, I would like to recognize the efforts of George Rhodes and several other Writing Fellows. George Rhodes has worked as a Writing Fellow for three years--taking at least one course at MCCC while also taking a full schedule at Eastern Michigan University. This in itself is commendable. Despite his workload, he found time to initiate a summer volunteer program that provided tutoring for our students during the summer session (our program is not budgeted for summer). He recruited several Writing Fellows to participate in this program and it proved to be very successful. They followed ten different courses in 1998 and provided students with tutoring they would not otherwise have had available. In addition to George, the students who volunteered their time in the summer are: Adam Poch, Amy Collins, Terri Celski, Jackie Brancheau, Monica Peterson, John McNett, Diane Agy, and Kelly Bowron. George Rhodes and and all who volunteered this summer demonstrate the quality and dedication

of all the Writing Fellows that I work with each semester.

The 1997-1998 year was a successful year of growth and development for the WAC program. We have continued to maintain quality that students and faculty have grown to expect, and we continue to set new goals for the coming years. Nevertheless, the heart of the WAC program continues to be the student tutors who are willing to work hard and actively participate in a program that takes much time and effort.

The last ten years have presented numerous challenges for WAC, but I think we have successfully fulfilled our mission to this date. We will obviously face new challenges in the future, but for the sake of our students, we hope that ten years from now, we will still be tutoring students in writing and we can perhaps conduct a twenty-year anniversary survey.

III A. Faculty and Student Surveys

In 1987 John Holladay, the WAC Coordinator at the time, conducted a campus survey of faculty to determine the type of WAC program that might best meet the needs of faculty and students at MCCC. In the spirit of the ten year anniversary of this report, we decided to conduct a mirror survey of Holladay's project (see appendix for 1987 survey). In addition, we decided to conduct a campus-wide student survey so that we might gauge students' awareness of our services and their attitudes about what we do (see section III. B.)

We assumed many changes have occurred since the original faculty survey in 1987—new faculty, both full and part-time; a growing emphasis on writing in the workplace; availability of writing labs on campus; and possibly, changing attitudes about writing in several areas. Given these potential changes, we recognize that the surveys from then and now, while asking the same questions, exist within a different context.

However, as some similarities and differences are still worth noting, a brief textual note is needed. Holiday's original survey, found in the appendix of this report, records data by the number of responding participants in each category while the 1997-1998 survey lists data in percentages. In addition, I have divided the results of this year's survey by full-time faculty and part-time faculty. I did this so that in future survey's we can track the differences in types of assignments, frequency of written work, and changing attitudes as they apply to the two groups. While the different formats and analysis create some difficulty in making statistical comparisons of the two reports, I have converted and compared some of the data within this textual discussion to facilitate understanding.

In addition to the above differences, it should also be noted that the number of respondents for Holladay's survey was approximately 50, while the number of respondents for the current survey was 36. In distributing the survey, I chose to make responses anonymous so as not to influence the answers to the questions. In retrospect, I probably should have kept a list of respondents so that I could have encouraged greater participation. Because Dr. Holladay only surveyed the full-time faculty, I will limit my comparisons to the full-time responses in both surveys, but also comment on differences between full-time faculty responses and part-time faculty responses from the current survey.

In the first column of numbers the faculty's determination of student writing problems seems to be consistent in both surveys. It is interesting to note, however, that in both surveys faculty

seem to focus on mechanical errors in writing with the same concern as content and organization problems. I assume this is true because faculty find mechanical errors to be a visible distraction to text readability. However, faculty also noted at about a 65% to 90% rate that organization, supporting ideas, originality, and coherence are also important in student writing; and that their students have persistent, or at least frequent, problems in these areas. In WAC we consider content and organization to be the greatest concern, and we train our tutors to always work with students in those areas first. We do however, recognize the frustration faculty experience as they attempt to negotiate a maize of mechanical errors.

When faculty were asked about the types of writing assignments they use for their courses, they responded in similar fashion to the 1987 survey, with a few differences. In both surveys essay exams and study questions seem to be frequently assigned. Current faculty, however, seem to be assigning more research papers, especially part-time faculty (81% at least sometimes); and critical analysis papers (55% to 60% for full and part-time faculty). In addition, the article review has increased slightly since the 1987 report (51% in 1987; 56% and 65% for full and part-time faculty in 1998). It is interesting that writing handbooks often refer to the argumentative essay as the most common college writing assignment; yet, our faculty do not seem to use argumentative writing very frequently (Holladay report indicates only 9 out of 40 faculty and the 1998 report indicates no more than 40%). Other assignments such as letters, lab reports, observation logs, are used sparingly.

When asked if their students are seriously handicapped by deficient writing skills, 70% of full-time and only 50% of part-time faculty answered yes, in comparison to 81% indicating yes in the 1987 report. Yet, even with this slight improvement, over 60% of the current faculty, both full and part-time, believe that MCCC should require two semesters of English as a remedy for writing deficiency, although one response suggested that two semesters of writing is "primitive and doesn't enhance a desire to learn." In support of the two semester requirement, I would suggest that this strategy would be consistent with the direction in which most colleges seem to be moving. When speaking with other WAC representatives at conferences, I find that most have a minimum of two semesters with several requiring an additional semester of writing in a specific discipline—this is commonly referred to as a writing pyramid.

Faculty in both the 1987 and 1988 reports noted support for other solutions as well. Strong support was evident for having faculty place more emphasis on writing competency in all areas of curriculum, with slightly less support for remedial writing courses for those students who demonstrate writing deficiency on the ASSET test. There is a significant increase from 1987 to 1988 in the number of faculty who would like more dialogue about writing within the college community, but even fewer in 1988 than in 1987 who want a required writing-proficiency exam as a graduation requirement. Specific comments follow each of the questions.

In looking at both reports, my conclusion is that my original assumption that change was inevitable, was in error. Students have not changed significantly in the last ten years in regards to their writing skills and the faculty remains concerned about students' writing deficiencies. On the plus side, however, the situation does not seem to have worsened. Who is to blame for these writing deficiencies? There are probably many contributing factors and placing blame never does much to solve the problem. I think the results of the current survey suggest, however, that we need the WAC program as much as we did ten years ago. The nature of a two-year college is that there will always be a fresh group of students who arrive with the same writing needs as the last group, and they will need a support system like WAC to help them improve their writing skill

Self-Evaluation Study MCCC Faculty:

Do your students have consistent, serious writing problems in the following areas?

	Full-time Faculty			Part-time Faculty		
	Yes	Sometimes	No	Yes	Sometimes	No
Organization	50%	35%	15%	25%	50%	25%
Narrowing a Topic	40%	25%	35%	6%	38%	56%
Supporting an Idea	40%	50%	10%	31%	44%	25%
Sense of Purpose	30%	45%	25%	31%	19%	50%
Audience Awareness	35%	35%	30%	12%	25%	63%
Tone	20%	45%	35%	12%	19%	69%
Originality	25%	40%	35%	31%	25%	44%
Coherence	30%	45%	25%	38%	31%	31%
Diction	30%	35%	35%	12%	44%	44%
Paragraph Structure	45%	40%	15%	19%	50%	31%
Sentence Construction	25%	50%	25%	44%	44%	12%
Grammar	55%	30%	15%	50%	31%	19%
Usage	35%	30%	35%	44%	38%	19%
Transitions	35%	35%	30%	25%	50%	25%
Revising	25%	25%	50%	19%	56%	25%
Research Skills	35%	30%	35%	31%	25%	44%
Punctuation	50%	35%	15%	38%	37%	25%
Spelling	50%	40%	10%	38%	37%	25%
Proofreading	55%	20%	25%	50%	31%	19%
Vocabulary	60%	15%	25%	19%	50%	31%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indicate the type of writing assignments your students are required to complete.

	Full-time Faculty			Part-time Faculty		
	Regularly	Sometimes	Never	Regularly	Sometimes	Never
Essay Exams	50%	35%	15%	25%	25%	50%
Article Reviews	15%	50%	35%	19%	37%	44%
Expository Essay	20%	15%	65%	12%	19%	69%
Lab Reports	20%	5%	75%	12%	0%	88%
Research Papers	40%	15%	45%	62%	19%	19%
Business Reports	10%	10%	80%	0%	6%	94%
Letters	5%	10%	85%	0%	12%	88%
Critical Analysis	40%	15%	45%	25%	38%	37%
Outlines	25%	10%	65%	19%	31%	50%
Study Questions	25%	35%	40%	12%	12%	76%
Observation Logs	0%	25%	75%	6%	19%	75%
Journals	20%	20%	60%	19%	19%	62%
Creative Writing	0%	15%	85%	6%	6%	88%
Argumentative	20%	15%	65%	19%	25%	56%

Please write a brief answer to each of the following questions

Full-time Faculty

Do you feel that a significant number of your students are seriously handicapped by deficient writing skills?

Yes 70% No 30%

Part-time Faculty

Yes 50% No 50%

Comments: "Not a significant number, just a few."

"Some have never had to write."

"Some are excellent, but most have serious problems with organization, grammar, and punctuation."

"I would say that the majority of my students suffer from mediocre to poor writing skills."

"Few have had adequate exposure to writing skills. Most don't value writing skills and believe they are subjected to unfair demands in essay exams."

If your students' writing is deficient, what do you feel our Community College should do to help improve writing?

Require two semester of English Composition.

Full-time Faculty		Part-time Faculty	
Yes 60%	No 40%	Yes 63%	No 37%

Comments: "When students transfer they will write papers for more than just composition class."

"This is primitive and doesn't enhance the desire to learn. With the advancement of computers, writing is becoming easier to check for spelling and grammar errors."

"This may not be practical."

"As their first two classes. They should take two semesters anyway because four-year colleges require two semesters or 6 hrs. to graduate."

"Many two and four-year schools do require it; we should follow with the same standards."

"The few who would benefit would not justify the added requirement."

Have faculty place more emphasis on writing competency in all areas of curriculum.

Full-time Faculty		Part-time Faculty	
Yes 85%	No 15%	Yes 75%	No 25%

Comments: "I believe that writing is a powerful tool of learning. Requiring students to write is one way to encourage them to 'think their way' into a subject."

"You need to show me how."

"Encourage, not mandate."

"The WAC program has helped. Most of our graduates will encounter a WAC class and will be better for it."

"Leave it to individual faculty. Unfortunately, some of these individuals don't write either."

"This is a good idea. Putting it into effect will require all instructors to be in agreement on the goal and at leas some of the means to be used to achieve it."

Have the college require remedial writing courses for all students who demonstrate serious writing deficiencies on the ASSET tests.

Full-time Faculty		Part-time Faculty	
Yes 75%	No 25%	Yes 75%	No 25%

Comments: "The problem here is getting the students to take the course and is it really the mission of the college to remediate?"

Create opportunities for faculty dialogue across the curriculum so that we may explore better ways of reinforcing writing skills in all disciplines.

Full-time Faculty		Part-time Faculty	
Yes 70%	No 30%	Yes 94%	No 6%

Comments: "I'd like to pair up with an English class and work together on writing assignments."

"Might be very helpful if we all emphasize the same aspects of effective writing."

"The faculty might compile a list of various writing assignments . . . used to improve writing skills."

"Takes too much time."

Have the college require a writing-proficiency exam as a graduation requirement.

Full-time Faculty		Part-time Faculty	
Yes 35%	No 65%	Yes 19%	No 81%

Comments:

"Isn't this covered by a student passing the English Composition class?"

"The problem is who would administer it or correct it?

"This is happening all over. Test needs to be statistically validated, however."

"Most who have tried this find it does not work as designed. It needs to be demonstrated in class work all along the way."

"My undergraduate school required a writing exam before you could move to upper division (junior-senior) classes. I'm not sure we could require it in today's climate."

Do you support attempt to foster a campus-wide emphasis on improving writing skills across the curriculum?

Full-time Faculty		Part-time Faculty	
Yes 85%	No 15%	Yes 100%	No 0%

Comments:

"Students need to see that writing is important in all courses."

"Yes, with reservations. I have already had to rearrange my curriculum for assessment."

"Depends on what the attempts are specifically."

Other things I think we could do to improve students' writings?

Comments:

"Students need to see a purpose in writing and not view it as a requirement to graduate. Being able to communicate through writing is important. Students don't seem to care—they just want to get it done."

"Two required semesters of English Composition."

"A required motivational workshop for all full and part-time faculty. The more excited and involved we are, the easier it will be to pass this on to our students. Offer writing clinics to our currently enrolled students—one Saturday per month.

"Force them to write. Fail them if they don't. Let them know the importance of written communication. Convince instructors that style, grammar, syntax, etc. are just as important as content and should also be corrected and graded as part of their grade."

"I find my students capable of completing 'small' tightly-focused projects with assistance of Writing Fellows. I would not dare to assign a bona-fide research paper to my students. They need detailed attention in order to complete my assignments successfully."

"Require early enrollment in English 151 and 152."

"Continue workshops and professional development across the curriculum so all new faculty and current faculty are reminded of the need."

"Support attendance by faculty in sessions conducted by the National Writing Project."

III. B. Self-Evaluation Study MCCC Students

Our purpose in conducting the student survey was twofold. We wanted to look at students who had not used the Writing Center, nor had been exposed to the WAC program, to find out why they had not and what we could do about it. In addition, we wanted to look at students who have used the Writing Center, and who have been exposed to the WAC program, to find out how we are doing. In both areas we think we generated some useful information.

Over 80% of respondents think the Writing Center is accessible and that we have a sufficient number of hours that we are open. When students did not think we were accessible, anecdotal comments were almost always from evening students who find time for tutoring limited. We were encouraged that 68% of respondents said they were adequately informed about the WAC program. This indicates to us that our efforts are successful, although more needs to be done in this area to increase the awareness. We are also encouraged that 39% stated they would be interested in online (email) tutoring. We did not think the interest would be that high. This may speak to the fact that more and more students are computer-wise and equipped to use online tutoring. The last question in Section I of the survey asked students if they think the program should continue and 86% of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed.

In section II of the survey, only students who had conferenced in the Writing Center responded. Their responses indicate that the Writing Fellows are to some degree knowledgeable about writing (76%), that Writing Fellows provide tutoring in a clear and effective manner (72%), and that students are made to feel welcome in the Writing Center (77%). In each of these areas, those who disagreed were less then 5%.

The last five questions in section II of the survey had a high number of "No Opinion" responses. This may be because the writing skills we addressed in these questions are difficult steps in the writing process, and it may be that

tutoring does not lessen the overall sense of insecurity students have about writing. For example, while 48% of respondents said that they have developed a more positive attitude about writing and are more confident about completing future projects, 38% had no opinion and 13% either disagreed or strongly disagreed at some level. In addition, 38% of respondents had no opinion about feeling comfortable with prewriting techniques, and 19% were not comfortable with them at all. Respondents agree that they feel intimidated by writing assignments (44%), but more than half had no opinion or disagreed. These may be areas where we can focus tutor training; however, it is probably unlikely that most students will feel confident about writing, even when they are doing well.

Section III of the student survey addressed respondents who had not conferenced in the Writing Center. This section was very encouraging in that we tried to address the areas that we expected might be inhibitors for students who are not using our services. However, we discovered that our expected barriers for students did not concur with student responses. In general, they are aware of the program, they do not think it is just for remediation, they are not embarrassed to use the service, nor do they think it is intimidating. So why do they not use the service? From the anecdotal comments it may be because of time restrictions, fewer evening hours that we are open, and availability of tutoring at Whitman Center.

While we tried to distribute the survey to as broad a cross-section of students as possible, the data from section IV of the survey suggests that most of the respondents were daytime students with 12 or more semester hours, or daytime students with less than 12 hours. Only 23% were night or weekend students. We also learned in section V of the survey that most students became aware of the WAC program in two ways: either by their professors discussing it in class or by a class presentation by Writing Fellows. We are hoping are current poster campaign improves awareness as well, and I ask Writing Fellows each semester to suggest ways that we might better communicate our existence to students.

As stated previously, the things we learned from the student survey should help us improve the WAC program. The survey results have provided us with several target areas that we can begin to address with both long and short-term strategies. Our intention is to repeat this survey, and the faculty survey, every few years to gauge changes in attitudes about writing, and to address different needs of students and faculty as the educational process evolves.

Section II. *Answered by all respondents*	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The location of the Writing Center is easily accessible, and the number of hours the Writing Center is open seems adequate.	45%	41%	11%	2	1%
I was adequately informed about the Writing Fellow program when I first entered MCCC.	33%	35%	9%	15%	8%

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Writing Fellows (tutors) introduced The Writing Center in my class, and I think it answered many questions.	22%	27&	26%	15%	10%
I am aware that Writing Fellows are MCCC students.	60%	25%	7%	4%	4%
I would be interested in email or on-line conferences with Writing Fellows.	21%	18%	38%	12%	11%
The Writing Center is a service the college should continue to provide.	66%	20%	11%	1%	2%

Section II. *Students who have conferenced in the Writing Center.*	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The Writing Fellows seem knowledgeable about writing and the writing process.	41%	35%	19%	4%	1%
Writing Fellows provide tutoring in a clear and effective manner.	34%	38%	24%	3%	1%
Students are made to feel welcome when the visit the Writing Center.	42%	35%	21%	1%	1%
As a result of the support given by the Writing Center, I think my paper grade was higher than it would otherwise have been.	27%	27$	38%	5%	3%
The Writing Center helped me learn the Steps of the writing process (prewriting, drafting, revising, editing).	15%	28%	38%	14%	5%

My work at the Writing Center helped me develop a positive attitude towards writing, and now I feel more confident and capable of accomplishing my writing projects.	17%	31%	39%	11%	2%
At the Writing Center, I learned the benefits of developing ideas for writing through the use of discovery techniques (prewriting).	15%	29%	42%	10%	4%
I feel less intimidated by writing tasks as a result of my experience at the Writing Center.	19%	25%	43%	8%	5%

Section III. *Students who have not conferenced in the Writing Center.*	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I have not been to the Writing Center because I didn't know about it.	14%	8%	14%	35%	29%
I assumed the Writing Center is aimed at remedial courses for students with disabilities.	5%	6%	25%	33%	31%
I have avoided using the Writing Center for fear of being embarrassed for seeking help.	4%	5%	16%	38%	37%
I would like to use the Writing Center but feel it's intimidating.	3%	8%	19%	39%	31%
I have not seen a Writing Fellow because I don't know how to go about making an appointment.	7%	14%	19%	35%	25%

Section IV. *All survey respondents.*

Which of the following most represents you?

Daytime Student—12 or more semester hours:	48%
Night or weekend student—12 or more semester hours:	6%
Daytime student—less than 12 hours:	29%
Night or weekend student—less than 12 hours:	17%

Section V. *All survey respondents.*

How did you hear about the Writing Fellow program?

Class presentation by a Writing Fellow:	34%
Instructor:	46%
Poster:	1%
Friend:	5%
Orientation:	3%
Other:	3%
Before this survey, I was unaware of the Writing Fellow program:	8%

Comments

Do you have any suggestions or comments that would contribute to improving the Writing Fellow program? (*Responses are representative of all the respondents*)

"Put a Writing Center at Whitman."

"The Writing Center provides a good service. It really helps students like me who are not dumb but need help developing ideas."

"They need to know more about how we're being taught in class, then they will feel more equipped and better able to help us."

"I think that the Writing Fellows should know the instructions given by the professors before they try to help. Communications is important, but I'm not blaming the Writing Fellows."

"Allow the Writing Fellow to be an editor. Having them refer me to the MLA Handbook isn't that helpful when I need someone to edit my paper."

"They should write on papers making suggestions on grammar."

"Should not be a requirement for any class—should be optional for all students, myself included. I have no time for the Writing Center."

"Have more classes have it mandatory to see Writing Fellows."

"It's a great free program"

"When I saw a Writing Fellow he showed me techniques to find mistakes but he personally didn't help me. I think he would have been more helpful to help me find my mistakes then show me techniques to correct them and write better papers in the future."

"Open longer on Saturdays for people who work."

"It seems to be working well. My instructor made in mandatory for us to visit the Center. I am glad he did. Otherwise I would not have gone."

"I think it's a little small. Maybe in the near future build private rooms that way your not distracted by other students in the room."

"If possible have the Writing Fellow read the paper before the student/Writing Fellow appointment."

"I think the program works well."

"One hour appointments would be more helpful."

IV. 1997-1998 Writing Fellows

Because of the nature of two year colleges, the turnover for Writing Fellows is inevitable. We have been fortunate, however, in that we have had many Writing Fellows remain in the program even while attending other colleges. Nevertheless, this year we lost many Senior Writing Fellows who had been part of the program for two years or more. Because of this, many of the Writing Fellows in 1997-1998 were Novice Writing Fellows. In fact, over half of all the Writing Fellows for this academic year had only one semester of experience.

Therefore, the challenge this year was to train many new tutors while maintaining the quality of tutoring that students and faculty on MCCC's campus have grown to expect. We think we accomplished the task. To reach this end, each of the new Writing Fellows was assigned a mentor Writing Fellow to answer questions; help out in difficult situations; and review with the novice Writing Fellow procedures, tutoring strategies, and paper work. We have found that this lowers the anxiety of the new Writing Fellow, and provides a review lesson for the Senior Writing Fellow. Both Senior and Novice Writing Fellows find this experience valuable.

As always, each novice Writing Fellow completes our 254 Advanced Composition course--this provides a consistency in the training, as well as a sense of community among the Writing Fellows. The 254 course is used both as a laboratory tutoring experience and as a collaborative writing experience. Assignments in the course are designed to familiarize Writing Fellows with the type of writing assignments they will most frequently encounter in the Writing Center. Since each of them has experienced the same training methods, learned the same tutoring strategies (with a few minor changes), and must meet the same expectations as all the other Writing Fellows, they have a sense of involvement in a community experience. This is important to the work Writing Fellows are executing.

Each Writing Fellow also attends a monthly meeting. These meetings are not just for business, but rather they are work sessions that are designed to help Writing Fellows collaborate on real tutoring strategies. At the meetings this year, Writing Fellows experienced role-plays to demonstrate how different tutoring experiences might be handled. They also participated in round table discussions, offered opinions on scholarly articles they read prior to the meetings, and presented reports on conferences they attended. In general, the feedback on these meetings from Writing Fellows is positive (see section VIII of this report), and Writing Fellows come away, once again, with a stronger sense of belonging to a community of writers and tutors.

As in the past, the goal of each Writing Fellow is to help students become better thinkers and writers, but the Writing Fellows themselves also receive benefits. We think that the well-rounded approach of mentoring, training, and collaboration provides Writing Fellows with confidence, a sense of professionalism, and a sense of community that they need to be successful. Many of our Writing Fellows have gone on to Honors Programs in other universities, as well as positions of employment in the community; and they have told me their tutoring and writing experiences at MCCC were the most important factors in their selection to the position. We are always quite pleased and proud to hear of these experiences.

Because our Writing-Across-the-Curriculum program has experienced success over the last few years, we try to maintain a Writing Fellow count between 30 and 35 each semester. This has allowed us to meet the needs of the faculty and maintain a consistent budget. This number seems to be both a realistic and manageable number of Writing Fellows. We thank the faculty at MCCC for consistently participating in the selection of new Writing Fellows through the nomination process. Other schools of similar size or larger, find it difficult to recruit writing tutors for their programs and often operate with far fewer than 30 tutors a semester. So our method of finding and selecting tutors continues to work well.

Each Writing Fellow works two hours each week in the Writing Center, and each of them is assigned to a specific course as the first reader of students' papers. In total, each Writing Fellow works about 45 hours per semester, and anyone who had graded large numbers of essays or research papers realizes the work and effort that goes into this task. In addition to reading each student's paper and completing an extensive progress report, the Writing Fellow meets with each student for a half hour conference to discuss strengths and weaknesses in thinking and

writing. This system seems to work well as noted in the student evaluations in section VII of this report.

As I have stated in other reports, I am often amazed by the Writing Fellows' level of dedication and the willingness to work so diligently on the arduous task of helping students improve their writing. These students are to be commended in every way possible. I expect many of them will find success in life, and I am certain they will look back on the MCCC WAC program as having a positive influence in helping them reach their goals.

This year we had 51 Writing Fellows enrolled in the WAC program. Their combined experience adds up to 107 semesters. In comparison we had 41 Writing Fellows last year with a combined semester experience of 99 semesters. This increase in the number of semesters is a result of the 20% increase in the number of Writing Fellows. The 1997-1998 Writing Fellows, with the number of semesters of experience for each, is as follows:

Diana Agy (7)
Nichole Ball (4)
Bonnie Berry (4)
Kim Blaker (1)
Judy Boldt (2)
Melissa Bosh (1)
Tracy Boudrie (5)
Kelly Bowron (1)
Jackie Brancheau (1)
Clarissa Calhoun (1)
Terri Celski (3)
Amy Collins (4)
Jennifer Dahl (1)
Jonathan Downing (1)
Carol Flor (1)
Jennifer Hammer (2)
Joan Harris (1)
Suzy Hernandez (1)
Courtney Howard (1)
Scott Houk (1)
Justin Johns (1)
Carrie Kenney (1)
Lorraine Koenig (3)
Pat LeBlanc (2)
Hilary Little (1)
Josh Ludwick (1)
Penney Luplow (3)
Tim Lusch (3)
John McNett (2)
Michelle McLaughlin (3)
Steve Mullins (4)
Monica Peterson (1)
Adam Poch (2)
Christine Poniewozik (1)
Jill Pugh (2)
Jaclyn Raymond (1)
George Rhodes (6)
Steve Riggs (2)
Lee Ann Salas (1)
Linda Secco (3)
Joy Sharkey (1)
Lisa Smith (4)
Shane Spaulding (1)
Vanya Steel (2)
Dionne Swor (1)
Mischele Tomich (3)
Tod Tue (1)
Angie Ucci (2)
Susan Vincelli (4)
Phyllis Whitacre (1)
Brenda Young (1)

V. Scheduling

At MCCC we continue to develop our writing-across-the-curriculum program in conjunction with the daily operation of the MCCC Writing Center. Because of this relationship between what many colleges consider two separate programs, our writing program flourishes. The WAC program facilitates writing in courses across disciplines, and the Writing Center is a support program for students who find themselves either unprepared to meet the rigors of writing, or for students who recognize that learning to write is an ongoing process and that even the best writers benefit from audience feedback. To meet the needs of both types of students, our Writing Fellows work as tutors in two different capacities.

At the core of our WAC program is the effort of faculty to incorporate writing into their courses. So that we might help both students and faculty in this endeavor, we assign individual Writing Fellows to instructors who request them. These Writing Fellows introduce the WAC program to the students and schedule conferences with each student in the class. Writing Fellows may assist students by teaching them prewriting strategies, drafting and revision techniques, or methods for finding and correcting mechanical errors. The Writing Fellow is, in fact, available to each student during the entire process of writing a paper.

This portion of the WAC program is important because it exposes students to writing support of which they might otherwise be unaware. From our statistics and our anecdotal student evaluations, we know that once students come to the Writing Center, they are much more likely to use the service several times before leaving MCCC. The instructors and professors who participate in this program certainly deserve recognition. They have accepted the challenge requiring their students to use writing as a learning tool, and they have accepted the work and responsibility involved in making this a successful program. Their names, courses, and the Writing Fellows with whom they worked are listed below.

Writing Fellows also work in the Writing Center on a two hour weekly schedule. As stated earlier in this report, they are available to help students who are not in fellowed courses who might seek assistance with any stage of the writing process. Most of these students have made an appointment on their own because they have either been to the Writing Center in the past, or because they have learned about our services through our advertising campaign or other means.

I have included the weekly schedules for 1997-1998 in this report to display the number of hours Writing Fellows are available to students each week. While Writing Fellows are not available every hour of the day, we think we have more than adequate coverage to meet the needs of most students. However, evening availability continues to be a problem because of the difficulty in finding Writing Fellows who can work late into the evening, and because of the limited time evening students have for using support services outside of scheduled class time.

Community college students are generally not traditional students. Their time is usually limited, and because this is a commuter campus, many of them are unaware of the numerous support services we offer. In the WAC program we hope that our efforts to reach out to students will enable them to make positive use of our services and become aware of other support programs as well. We think our collaborative approach to writing across the curriculum and writing centers is the best way to make that happen for our students.

WRITING FELLOW ASSIGNMENTS: Fall 1997

Instructor	Course	Day(s)	Time	Enrollment	Writing Fellows
Robert Merkel	Engl 256-01	T/R	9:30-11	21	Lorrie Koenig
	Engl 256-02	MWF	1-2	10	Amy Collins
	Music 165-01	T/R	11-12:30	23	Linda Secco
John Holladay	Phil 151-01	MWF	9-10	24	Phyllis Whitacr
	Phil 152-01	T/R	9:30-11	26	John McNett
	Phil 152-02	T/R	5:30-7 p.m.	32	Steve Riggs Adam Poch
	Engl 252-01	MWF	11-12	16	Amy Collins
James Devries	Soc 151-02	T/R	11-12:30	29	George Rhodes
	Soc 151-05	T/R	1:30-3	29	Tim Lusch
	Anthr 152-01	MWF	12-1	30	Diana Agy Bonnie Berry
Margie Bacarella	Polsc 151-03	T/R	9:30-11	37	Marcie Giraud Pat LeBlanc
	Polsc 151-61	T/R	5:30-7 p.m.	22	Steve Mullins
Michael Mohn	Mech 101-01	M/W	10-12	22	Nichole Ball
	Mech 101-02	T/R	7-9 p.m.	25	Lisa Smith
Robert Tarrant	Acctng 251-01	MW	5-7 p.m.	17	Michelle McLaughlin
	Acctng 251-51	T/R	5:30-7 p.m.	17	Terri Celski
Terry Telfer	Engl 255-51	S	9-12	19	Scott Houk
Lawrence Leach	Phil 253-51	MWF	10:30-12	9	Terri Celski
	Spch 151-02	T/R	9:30-11	24	Lee Ann Salas
Cyril Yuergens	Acctng 255-51	T/R	7:40-9 p.m.	8	Bonnie Berry
Roger Spalding	Astrn 151-01	T/R	7-9 p.m.	32	Penny Luplow Suzy Hernande
Don Hyatt	Busad 151-01	T/R	2-4	34	Sue Vincelli Angie Ucci
Barb Michalski	Psych 151-14	T/R	5:30-7 p.m.	29	Vanya Steel Jennifer Hammer

Barbara Long	Physc 151-01	M/W	5:30-7 p.m.	12	Jacklyn Raymond
Mark Wenzel	Econ 252-01	T/R	11-12:30	8	Tracy Boudrie
Fred Gruber	Econ 251-04	T/R	5:30-7 p.m.	28	Judy Boldt Jill Pugh
Gil Kohler	Soc 151-52	M/W	5:30-7 p.m.	27	Brenda Young
Jo Ann Jackson	Engl 252-02	M/W	5:30-7 p.m.	15	Mischele Tomich

WRITING FELLOW ASSIGNMENTS: WINTER 1998

Instructor	Course	Day(s)	Time	Enrollment	Writing Fellows
Robert Merkel	Engl 256-01	T/R	11:00-12:30	19	Amy Collins
	Engl 256-02	M/W	2:00-3:30	11	Chrissy Poniewozik
	Music 165-01	T/R	9:30-11:00	24	Jennifer Dahl
John Holladay	Phil 151-01	M/W/F	11:00-12:00	31	Kim Blaker Jon Downing
	Phil 152-01	T/R	9:30-11:00	29	Adam Poch Joy Sharkey
James Devries	Soc 151-01	M/W/F	8:00-9:00	28	Sue Vincelli
	Soc 151-02	T/R	8:00-9:30	30	Melissa Bosh Tim Lusch
	Hist 256-01	M/W/F	10:00-11:00	14	Bonnie Berry
Michael Mohn	Mech 101-01	M/W	10:00-12:00	8	Nichole Ball
	Mech 101-02	M/W	5:00-7:00 p.m.	15	Jill Pugh
	Weld 105-01	T/R	5:00-7:00 p.m.	14	Angie Ucci
Robert Tarrant	Acctg 254-01	M/W	5:00-7:00 p.m.	14	Joan Harris
Lawrence Leach	Phil 152-51(w)	M/W	1:00-2:30	19	Justin Johns
	Spch 151-02	T/R	9:30-11:00	15	Courtny Howard
	Spch 151-04	T/R	11:00-12:30	22	John McNett

Kim Goss	Music 265-01	T/R	4:00-5:30	19	Pat LeBlanc
Mark Wenzel	Econ 251-03	M/W	5:30-7:00	29	Dionne Swor Adam Poch
	Econ 252-02	R	7:00-10:00	13	Amy Collins
Melissa Jeter	Soc 151-52 (w)	T/R	5:30-7:00	28	Terri Celski
Sanford Stein	Hist 155-51 (w)	T/R	5:30-7:00	24	Kelly Bowron
Wendy Wysocki	Econ 251-01	M/W	8:30-10:00	28	Hammer
	Econ 251-02	T/R	1:30-3:00	29	Jennifer Hammer Monica Peterson Calye Calhoun
	Bmgt 101-01	M/W	1:00-2:30	26	Michelle McLaughlin Ryan Smith
Joanna Briganti	Polsc 101-01	T/R	11:00-12:30	13	Bonnie Berry
	Polsc 151-07	M/W	1:00-2:30	31	Jackie Brancheau Todd Tue
	Polsc 151-09	M/W	3:00-4:30	31	Carol Flor Hilary Little
	Polsc 151-10	M/W	5:30-7:00	29	Josh Ludwick George Rhodes
	Polsc 151-01	F	9:00-12:00	29	Shane Spaulding Nichole Ball
Cheryl McKay	Acctg 205-01	T/R	7:00-8:30	13	Judy Boldt
William McCloskey	Engl 260-01	M/W	5:30-7:00	17	George Rhodes
Gil Kohler	Soc 152-02	T	5:30-8:30	16	Carrie Kenney

Writing Center Schedule: Fall 1997

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8 -9	Phyllis Whitacre	Vanya Steel Phyllis Whitacre	Judy Boldt		Judy Boldt	
9-10	Sue Vincelli Michelle McLaughlin	Lee Ann Salas Vanya Steel	Terri Celaki Michelle McLaughlin	Lee Ann Salas		
10-11	Mischele Tomich Sue Vincelli	George Rhodes Jennifer Hammer	John McNett	George Rhodes Linda Secco	Diana Agy Tracy Boudrie	Amy Collins Penny Luplow
11-12	Mischele Tomich John McNett		Jennifer Hammer	Linda Secco Amy Collins	Tracy Boudrie Adam Poch	Penny Luplow
12-1	Pat LeBlanc		Scott Houk		Diana Agy Adam Poch	
1-2	Pat LeBlanc Marcie Giraud	Tim Lusch	Scott Houk Marcie Giraud	Bonnie Berry		
2-3	Steve Riggs Steve Mullins	Tim Lusch	Steve Riggs	Bonnie Berry	Lisa Smith Jaclyn Raymond	
3-4	Steve Mullins			Brenda Young	Lisa Smith	
4-5	Lorrie Koenig		Lorrie Koenig	Brenda Young		
5-6		Jill Pugh Angie Ucci		Nochole Ball Jill Pugh		
6-7	Suzy Hernandez	Angie Ucci Jaclyn Raymond	Suzy Hernandez	Terri Celaki Nichole Ball		

Writing Center Schedule: Winter 1998

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8 -9	Calye Calhoun Jackie Brancheau		Todd Tue	Todd Tue	Calye Calhoun Jackie Brancheau	
9-10	Judy Boldt	Tim Lusch	Judy Boldt	Courtney Howard	Michelle Mclaughlin	George Rhodes
10-11	Justin Johns	Jennifer Hammer Jennifer Dahl	Amy Collins Justin Johns	Jennifer Hammer Adam Poch	Amy Collins Adam Poch	George Rhodes
11-12	Hilary Little Kim Blaker	Bonnie Berry	Hilary Little	Bonnie Berry Nichole Ball	Jennifer Dahl Dionne Swor	
12-1	John McNett Ryan Smith	Terri Celski Susan Vincelli	John McNett Ryan Smith	Nochole Ball Terri Celski	Michelle Mclaughlin Tim Lusch	
1-2	Monica Peterson	Kim Blaker Pat LeBlanc	Monica Peterson Josh Ludwick	Carrie Kenney Pat LeBlanc	Josh Ludwick	
2-3	Chrissy Poniewozik	Shane Spaulding		Shane Spaulding	Chrissy Poniewozik	
3-4		Joan Harris	Carol Flor Carrie Kenney	Susan Vincelli		
4-5	Dionne Swor Courtney Howard	Joan Harris	Carol Flor	Joy Sharkey		
5-6		Angie Ucci		Joy Sharkey		
6-7	Jill Pugh	Angie Ucci Kelly Bowron	Jill Pugh	Kelly Bowron		

Writing Center Schedule: Spring 1998

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
8:00-9:00	George Rhodes	George Rhodes	George Rhodes Adam Poch	George Rhodes		
9:00-10:00	Amy Collins	Amy Collins Adam Poch	Amy Collins	George Rhodes Amy Collins		
10:00-11:00		Adam Poch				
11:00-12:00		Adam Poch				
12:00-1:00		Adam Poch		Amy Collins		
1:00-2:00	Sue Vincelli	Sue Vincelli				
2:00-3:00	Sue Vincelli	Sue Vincelli				
3:00-4:00	Sue Vincelli					
4:00-5:00						
5:00-6:00						
6:00-7:00						

VI. Statistics

We have continued to collect data regarding the use of the Writing Center. As in the past, I will use this data to focus of tutor training as well as gauge the needs of faculty and students using our services. The statistical data in this section records the number of conferences we conducted as well as dividing these numbers into to several categories. In addition, we document usage by department, the types of writing assignments, and the frequency of writing problems. Over the last few years we see a statistical picture emerging that can be of value to the development of the WAC program.

This year we conducted 2072 conferences. This is a decrease of 184 conferences from last year, but is still above the 2000 mark we set as a goal for this year. In 1994-1995 we conducted 1567 conference, 1995-1996 we conducted 1873 conferences, and in 1996-1997 we conducted 2256 conferences. We expected a leveling of these numbers at some point; however, we think a 2000 conference per year goal is realistic and attainable as long as enrollment remains constant.

One interesting statistic is the number of students who made appointments on their own to see a Writing Fellow compared to the number of students who were required to see a Writing Fellow from a fellowed class. This year the numbers were appointment—942, Fellowed Class—974. In past years, the number of student-generated appointments fell about 30%-40% short of required conferences. While we will need to watch this number over the next few years, it suggests that our efforts in communicating our services to students has found a degree of success.

On the disappointing side, we noted this year that the number of participating faculty from outside the Humanities Division decreased. The Business Division dropped from 289 conferences last year to 122 conferences for 1997-1998. Likewise, Science and Mathematics Division dropped from 189 to 86. Industrial Technology remained about the same (77 to 71) and Health Science had a modest increase from 47 last year to 55 for 1997-1998. These numbers indicate that we at least need to refocus our efforts to increase the amount and frequency of required writing in all disciplines.

The 500 word theme remains the most frequently assigned writing with the research paper the second most frequent. Other writing includes book and article reviews, and business reports. These statistics are important because this information determines the focus of our tutor training in Advanced Composition. All of the tutors practice writing models that faculty use most frequently. This way, the Writing Fellows have real writing experiences (beyond the theoretical) they can use in conferencing.

Other significant statistics show that "revision" is the step that students are struggling with. This means they have a first draft of the paper, but need help with global problems like organization, thesis statements, topic sentences, and transition. Second in frequency in the writing process is "prewriting" with "editing" following a close third. The other types of problems such as writing introductions and conclusions, and arranging paragraphs has remained consistent over the last few years. In addition, the number of students needing help with MLA format and instructor's directions remained the same as last year.

We hope our continued efforts to track this data will allow us to make changes to the WAC program as needed. Our philosophy continues to be that the best WAC program is the one that addresses the needs of the students. The following pages divide the 1997-1998 statistics by fall, winter, and spring semesters. The last page is a compilation of all three semesters.

The Writing Center: Semester Statistical Data

Semester: Fall-1997 **Dates: from** Sept. **to** Dec.

No. of Writing Conferences: Total 1078 **Assignment Sheet** Yes 678 No 400

Appointment	489	Main Campus	1035
Fellowed Class	512	Whitman	27
Walk-in	077	Jefferson	16

Department Represented:

Hum/Soc Science	944	Health Science	07
Business	43	Science/Math	51
Ind Tech	33		

Writing Assignment:

500+ Word Theme	525	Essay Test	09	Paragraph	05
Bk/Art Review	91	Journal	40	Res. Paper	273
Business Report	46	Lab Report	14	Tech. Report	19
Creative Writing	06	Outline	08	Other	42

Stage of Writing Process:

Prewriting	203	Final Draft	33
Revision	766	Rewrite Final	02
Editing	128		

WF Assisted W/Content:

Subject (ideas)	63	Topic Sentences	59
Thesis	160	Purpose/Audience	60
Development	376	Other	41

Method of Organization:

Example	09	Descriptive	14
Comparison	24	Definition	08
Div/Class	02	Analogy	00
Narrative/Chron	04	Argument	62
Analysis	18	Process	00
Cause/Effect	03	Other	02

WF Assisted W/Organization

Arranging Ideas	99	Paragraph Unity	105
Introduction	218	Paragraph Cohesiveness	46
Paragraph Order	59	Conclusion	274

WF Assisted W/Style

Diction	146	Syntax	258

WF Assisted W/Editing

Punctuation	175	Frag-RO-FS	102
Spelling	97	Grammar	100

WF Assisted W/Format

MLA/APA etc.	239	Following Instructor's Directions	112

The Writing Center: Semester Statistical Data

Semester: Winter-1998 **Dates: from** Jan. **to** Apr.

No. of Writing Conferences: Total 945 **Assignment Sheet** Yes 704 No 241

Appointment	443	Main Campus	900
Fellowed Class	424	Whitman	45
Walk-in	78	Jefferson	00

Department Represented:

Hum/Soc Science	745	Health Science	48
Business	79	Science/Math	35
Ind Tech	38		

Writing Assignment:

500+ Word Theme	400	Essay Test	05	Paragraph	04
Bk/Art Review	159	Journal	01	Res. Paper	270
Business Report	57	Lab Report	22	Tech Report	05
Creative Writing	04	Outline	15	Other	03

Stage of Writing Process:

Prewriting	98	Final Draft	39
Revision	692	Rewrite Final	00
Editing	106		

WF Assisted W/Content:

Subject (ideas)	30	Topic Sentences	81
Thesis	117	Purpose/Audience	33
Development	449	Other	21

Method of Organization:

Example	10	Descriptive	33
Comparison	20	Definition	19
Div/Class	03	Analogy	00
Narrative/Chron	03	Argument	56
Analysis	27	Process	18
Cause/Effect	00	Other	01

WF Assisted W/Organization

Arranging Ideas	71	Paragraph Unity	87
Introduction	167	Paragraph Cohesiveness	47
Paragraph Order	38	Conclusion	2 46

WF Assisted W/Style

Diction	111	Syntax	195

WF Assisted W/Editing

Punctuation	184	Frag-RO-FS	72
Spelling	70	Grammar	92

WF Assisted W/Format

MLA/APA etc.	191	Following Instructor's Directions	98

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Writing Center: Semester Statistical Data

Semester: Spring-1998 **Dates: from** Apr. **to** June

No. of Writing Conferences: Total 49 **Assignment Sheet** Yes 32 No 17

Appointment	10	Main Campus	48
Fellowed Class	38	Whitman	01
Walk-in	01	Jefferson	00

Department Represented:

Hum/Soc Science	49	Health Science	00
Business	00	Science/Math	00
Ind Tech	00		

Writing Assignment:

500+ Word Theme	16	Essay Test	00	Paragraph	00
Bk/Art Review	15	Journal	00	Res. Paper	04
Business Report	00	Lab Report	00	Tech Report	00
Creative Writing	00	Outline	13	Other	01

Stage of Writing Process:

Prewriting	17	Final Draft	00
Revision	27	Rewrite Final	02
Editing	01		

WF Assisted W/Content:

Subject (ideas)	00	Topic Sentences	00
Thesis	06	Purpose/Audience	08
Development	31	Other	00

Method of Organization:

Example	00	Descriptive	02
Comparison	00	Definition	00
Div/Class	00	Analogy	00
Narrative/Chron	00	Argument	02
Analysis	00	Process	00
Cause/Effect	00	Other	01

WF Assisted W/Organization

Arranging Ideas	07	Paragraph Unity	00
Introduction	06	Paragraph Cohesiveness	00
Paragraph Order	00	Conclusion	02

WF Assisted W/Style

Diction	11	Syntax	14

WF Assisted W/Editing

Punctuation	12	Frag-RO-FS	04
Spelling	04	Grammar	05

WF Assisted W/Format

MLA/APA etc.	24	Following Instructor's Directions	21

The Writing Center: 1997-1998 Statistical Data

Semester: FL-WI-SP 1997-1998 Totals **Dates: from** Sept. **to** June

No. of Writing Conferences: Total 2072 **Assignment Sheet** Yes 1414 No 658

Appointment	942	Main Campus	1983
Fellowed Class	974	Whitman	73
Walk-in	156	Jefferson	16

Department Represented:

Hum/Soc Science	1738	Health Science	55
Business	122	Science/Math	86
Ind Tech	71		

Writing Assignment:

500+ Word Theme	941	Essay Test	14	Paragraph	09
Bk/Art Review	265	Journal	41	Res. Paper	547
Business Report	103	Lab Report	36	Tech Report	24
Creative Writing	10	Outline	36	Other	45

Stage of Writing Process:

Prewriting	318	Final Draft	72
Revision	1485	Rewrite Final	04
Editing	235		

WF Assisted W/Content:

Subject (ideas)	93	Topic Sentences	140
Thesis	283	Purpose/Audience	101
Development	856	Other	62

Method of Organization:

Example	19	Descriptive	49
Comparison	44	Definition	27
Div/Class	05	Analogy	00
Narrative/Chron	07	Argument	120
Analysis	45	Process	18
Cause/Effect	03	Other	03

WF Assisted W/Organization

Arranging Ideas	177	Paragraph Unity	192
Introduction	391	Paragraph Cohesiveness	93
Paragraph Order	97	Conclusion	522

WF Assisted W/Style

Diction	268	Syntax	467

WF Assisted W/Editing

Punctuation	371	Frag-RO-FS	178
Spelling	171	Grammar	197

WF Assisted W/Format

MLA/APA etc.	454	Following Instructor's Directions	231

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VII. WAC Program Evaluation by Students

For 1997-1998 we have continued to survey students as they conference with Writing Fellows. This primarily anecdotal data provides us with information about specific conference experiences from the student perspective and provides us with feedback about the WAC program in general. In addition, we hope that an accumulation of this data over several years will begin to create a reliable profile of the WAC program as we strive to provide quality service to the students of MCCC.

This year we received 393 student evaluations in fall and winter semesters. This number represents an approximate 40% decrease in responses from last year. While it is disappointing that we did not have a greater response, the numbers should give an accurate anecdotal measurement of how students interact with the WAC program. In addition, we will focus in the upcoming year on increasing the number of student evaluations. We think this is important to our goals, but is also important for students, since the program is for them. We think that having students evaluate their tutoring experiences allows them to invest in MCCC's student services and gain a sense of belonging to the academic community—both important factors for students as they attempt to meet their academic goals.

As in the past three years, the evaluation responses clearly illustrate a strong student satisfaction with the WAC program and the Writing Center. In this section, I have provided anecdotal responses from students who were first time users of the Writing Center and from students who were repeat users of the Writing Center. Following those statements is a statistical description of how students use the Writing Center and how satisfied they are with procedures and services.

As I have stated in past reports, it is possible to produce quantitative data by recording things like the number of student visits to the Writing Center, the types of papers assigned by faculty, and how many students were satisfied with the WAC experience. More difficult, however, is the production of qualitative data. To measure whether or not a student improves his or her writing skills from one draft to another or to even more importantly determine if a student transfers learned writing skills from one academic discipline to another is a monumental task that we are not prepared to manage. A few colleges and universities—with financial assets and people-power well beyond our capabilities—have tried with some success to create qualitative studies. The results have been limited. So we must rely on the quantitative and anecdotal to gain a description of the WAC program at MCCC; but I think they provide us with an accurate appraisal of our program, given its size and goals.

First-time visitors overwhelmingly described the tutoring experience as "helpful." In addition, they noted that the Writing Fellows helped them understand assignments and understand writing strategies to complete those assignments. First-time users also commented on the friendly and relaxed atmosphere in the writing conferences and that they plan to return to the Writing Center for future writing projects. Negative comments by first-time users noted that more time (each conference is 30 minutes) might be needed for longer research papers that have not been read by a Writing Fellow prior to the conference. A few students expressed some discomfort in sharing their work with another person other than their instructors, but most agreed that it was still a valuable experience.

Repeat users of the Writing Center were also satisfied with our tutoring service. They noted the professionalism of the Writing Fellows, the tact and diplomacy used by Writing Fellows, and the genuine concern for each student's work

displayed by the Writing Fellows. They also wrote that they experienced real improvement in their writing and learned writing strategies to help them with future papers. A comment we receive fairly often is that students are inspired by their tutoring experience. Students seem to gain motivation by talking about their writing problems with a knowledgeable but understanding person. Negative comments noted the need for a different room or facility for the Writing Center and the lack of appointment times available in the evening. In the same vein, students noted difficulties in getting to the Writing Center when it is open. This also seems to primarily be a problem for night students with late (after 7:00 p.m.) classes.

The statistical data has remained remarkably constant over the last four years. I have included statistics from fall winter, and spring semesters individually, and from the inclusive academic year. My comments here reflect the statistical yearly results.

The number of students who were required to conference with a Writing Fellow dropped a few percentage points this year, and the number of students who visited the Writing Center of their own volition increased proportionally. In addition, the number of student who used the Writing Center because a Writing Fellow was assigned to the course dropped by 6% and the number of students who made appointments or were walk-ins increased proportionally. We hope these statistics indicate more students are becoming aware of the program and the quality service we provide. We will look at more closely at these statistics over the next few years to determine if a statistical pattern emerges.

The number of repeat users continues to outnumber first-time user by about 20%, indicating that students who use the Writing Center once often return when working on other projects. (The anecdotal data supports this conclusion also.) Other statistics remain constant from previous years. Questions about convenience in using the service, ability of the tutor to help with writing problems, and the way in which students were treated in the conference initiated overwhelmingly positive responses of 97% or better. Students also said (98%) that they would return to the Writing Center again.

When questioned about the helpfulness and effectiveness of individual conferences, written reports, individual Writing Fellows, and the Writing Center, students responded over 95% as very helpful and very effective or helpful and effective. Negative remarks in the range of marginally useful and unsatisfactory were less that 2% in every category.

These anecdotal responses and statistics indicate that the WAC program is effectively meeting its goals of providing students with quality tutoring and real writing skills they can use throughout their academic and employment careers. We take satisfaction in knowing we have contributed to the success of so many students, and that we have helped students gain confidence in their ability to write, think, and compete with others in academic disciplines across the curriculum.

Evaluation Questionnaire Comments

(Fall Semester: those using the Writing Center for the first time)

"The Writing Fellow program is helpful, but when coming to a conference you need to be sure to have the bulk of your draft done. I wasn't fully prepared so there wasn't much help she could give me."

"Lorrie was wonderful. She pointed out the problems in my paper and helped me see how different my approach could be by rearranging my thoughts. This is a great program and Lorrie did a great job."

"This was great. I'm very happy that I made an appointment for a Writing Fellow. I feel it was very helpful. Though I was aware of the problems I had, the WF helped make them clear to me."

"Half hour time slots may need to be longer when a 30+ page paper is submitted for review."

"The Writing Fellow was really willing to help me. He also helped me understand that writing these papers is much easier than it looks."

'My Writing Fellow was very helpful. She answered all questions and gave me an idea of what should be done for out next meeting."

"Her suggestions and help will improve my essay. She made me aware of my weak points in the paper. I have never been to the Writing Center before, and I believe this will help me to improve."

"My Writing Fellow was very helpful with explaining clearly what needs to be done on my paper and I was comfortable speaking with her. I usually don't like going over my work with others, but she helped me realize it will more than likely help me."

(Fall Semester: comments from those returning to the Writing Center)

My Writing Fellow gave me specific suggestions on how to improve my paper. I got ideas on how to qualify statements and how to restate my thesis to make it better understood. Great job!"

"I think Writing Fellows are very helpful and a definite asset to the college."

"The Writing Center is an excellent tool which should be used by all the students at MCCC."

"Need a different room for meeting with the Writing Fellows."

"Vanya was very helpful. She helped me by pointing out the weak points in my introduction and conclusion. I would like to schedule further appointments with her."

"I believe that all courses requiring papers, should also require students to have appointments with Writing Fellows."

"My conference was very helpful and she was very friendly. The only problem was I had to drive all the way out here when I didn't have class because the Writing Center isn't open after my class."

"We could have used more time. Her insight gave me many different avenues that I hadn't been aware of. She was very helpful."

My Writing Fellow was very helpful in identifying the small problems I had with my paper. He took the time to make sure I understood why I needed to change the things I did. Thanks!"

"They have a very professional attitude and pinpoint the major corrections you need in a paper."

(Winter Semester: those using the Writing Center for the first time)

"It was very helpful to have things pointed out that I missed. She also offered suggestions on how to make my paragraphs flow together. Overall the experience was very helpful."

"The Writing Fellow really put me at ease and I feel a lot more relaxed about beginning my project."

"I haven't used the Writing Fellow program before, but I would definitely use it again. It was very helpful and beneficial to me and to my paper."

"My paper is very important to me. I have already revised it 10 times. By doing this I have confused myself even more. Maria was very helpful in slowing me down to reorganize my thoughts. She gave me great ideas on how to organize my thoughts to get my most important points across."

"Since I had not had Composition II yet, the Writing Fellow was very helpful. The mechanics have changed quite a lot since I had written my last research paper."

(Winter Semester: comments from those returning to the Writing Center)

"I have had lots of good experiences with the Writing Center, and find it a valuable aid in writing papers."

"Maria has been an inspiration to me. She has helped me with the simple things that I have overlooked." I would encourage anyone and everyone to visit a Writing Fellow before a paper is due."

"The Writing Center needs more night appointments after 6 p.m. during weekdays."

"My Writing Fellow was friendly and seemed genuinely concerned about my paper. She also met with me on a day that she was not usually in the Writing Lab. She went out of her way to help me."

"It is very helpful to be able to talk about concerns or questions with regards to the paper. The conference gave me more confidence in being able to fulfill the assignment successfully."

"Well worth my time and effort!"

"I think the Writing Fellows are useful because people do not usually recognize problems in their own papers."

"I have used a Writing Fellow many times and I strongly encourage others to use them."

"I am pleased with my visit to the Writing Center. The Writing Fellow made me feel at ease and was tactful and diplomatic in his assessment of my paper. I found the time well spent and the suggestions quite valuable."

"My purpose was to get helpful revision ideas for my paper. I got exactly what I was looking for."

Fall Semester: 1997

The Writing Center

Student Evaluation Questionnaire Statistics

The total number of respondents was 165. Percentages indicated as 1% may actually be less.

Why did you come to The Writing Center?

Course requirement:	56%
Needed help with specific assignment:	26%
To improve writing skills:	17%
Reputation of the Writing Center	01%

How did you arrange your Writing Fellow conference?

Writing Fellow assigned to course:	34%
Made my own appointment:	58%
Walk-in (no appointment):	08%

Was this your first conference with a Writing Fellow?

yes: 41% no: 59%

Did you find it convenient to use the Writing Center?

yes: 99% no: 01%

Did the Writing Fellow identify problems in your writing of which you were unaware?

yes: 95% no: 05%

Was the Writing Fellow courteous and respectful?

yes: 99% no: 01%

Will you likely use the Writing Center again?

yes: 99% no: 01%

How helpful was the Writing Fellow Report (written comments about your paper)?

Very Helpful:	81%
Helpful:	18%
Marginally Helpful:	01%
Not Helpful:	00%

How helpful was your conference time with a Writing Fellow?

Very Helpful:	84%
Helpful:	15%
Marginally Helpful:	01%
Not Helpful:	00%

What is your overall evaluation of the Writing Fellow who helped you with your writing?

Very Effective:	87%
Effective:	12%
Marginally Effective:	01%
Not Effective:	00%

What is your overall evaluation of the Writing Center?

Very Effective:	84%
Effective:	15%
Marginally Useful:	01%
Unsatisfactory	01%

Winter Semester: 1998

The Writing Center

Student Evaluation Questionnaire Statistics

The total number of respondents was 228. Percentages indicated as 1% may actually be less.

Why did you come to The Writing Center?

Course requirement:	68%
Needed help with specific assignment:	22%
To improve writing skills:	10%
Reputation of the Writing Center	00%

How did you arrange your Writing Fellow conference?

Writing Fellow assigned to course:	44%
Made my own appointment:	50%
Walk-in (no appointment):	06%

Was this your first conference with a Writing Fellow?

yes: 39% no: 61%

Did you find it convenient to use the Writing Center?

yes: 98% no: 02%

Did the Writing Fellow identify problems in your writing of which you were unaware?

yes: 98% no: 02%

Was the Writing Fellow courteous and respectful?

yes: 100% no: 00%

Will you likely use the Writing Center again?

yes: 97% no: 03%

How helpful was the Writing Fellow Report (written comments about your paper)?

Very Helpful:	79%
Helpful:	20%
Marginally Helpful:	01%
Not Helpful:	00%

How helpful was your conference time with a Writing Fellow?

Very Helpful:	77%
Helpful:	22%
Marginally Helpful:	00%
Not Helpful:	01%

What is your overall evaluation of the Writing Fellow who helped you with your writing?

Very Effective:	88%
Effective:	10%
Marginally Effective:	01%
Not Effective:	01%

What is your overall evaluation of the Writing Center?

Very Effective:	75%
Effective:	23%
Marginally Useful:	01%
Unsatisfactory	01%

1997-1998 Academic Year

The Writing Center

Student Evaluation Questionnaire Statistics

The total number of respondents was 393. Percentages indicated as 1% may actually be less.

Why did you come to The Writing Center?

Course requirement:	63%
Needed help with specific assignment:	24%
To improve writing skills:	12%
Reputation of the Writing Center	01%

How did you arrange your Writing Fellow conference?

Writing Fellow assigned to course:	40%
Made my own appointment:	53%
Walk-in (no appointment):	07%

Was this your first conference with a Writing Fellow?

yes: 40% no: 60%

Did you find it convenient to use the Writing Center?

yes: 98% no: 02%

Did the Writing Fellow identify problems in your writing of which you were unaware?

yes: 97% no: 03%

Was the Writing Fellow courteous and respectful?

yes: 99% no: 01%

Will you likely use the Writing Center again?

yes: 98% no: 02%

How helpful was the Writing Fellow Report (written comments about your paper)?

Very Helpful:	80%
Helpful:	19%
Marginally Helpful:	01%
Not Helpful:	00%

How helpful was your conference time with a Writing Fellow?

Very Helpful:	80%
Helpful:	19%
Marginally Helpful:	01%
Not Helpful:	01%

What is your overall evaluation of the Writing Fellow who helped you with your writing?

Very Effective:	87%
Effective:	11%
Marginally Effective:	01%
Not Effective:	01%

What is your overall evaluation of the Writing Center?

Very Effective:	79%
Effective:	19%
Marginally Useful:	01%
Unsatisfactory	01%

VIII. WAC Evaluation by Writing Fellows

For those who would read this report, I think it is valuable to provide the insight drawn from the Writing Fellows who work in the program from day to day. They, more than I, deal with students from a broad range of abilities and preparations. The Writing Fellows must meet the challenges of setting and maintaining schedules, working with students who are sometimes less than interested in their work, and developing their own skills through on-going training.

Often during the semester, Writing Fellows discuss problems they encounter as tutors with me, and we try to find workable solutions. However, I am sure there are problems that go unchecked because of time and immediacy; therefore, an opportunity to give voice to these problems can only benefit the WAC program and the people who work in it. I respond to the concerns of the Writing Fellows at the first few meetings of each school year, and I try to follow up with long-range strategies to avoid future problems. At the same time, we are always glad to hear about success stories and things that seem to work well.

The questionnaire the Writing Fellows respond to asks them to write about their experiences as a Writing Fellow, and their training and scheduling. The questionnaire also asks them to evaluate program philosophy and offer suggestions for improvement. There are 20 questions on this year's evaluation form. I change a couple of questions on the form each year to maintain a current focus on the program for that year. However, many of the questions have been carried over from year to year. Each year I try to vary the questions and answers in the report to offer a broad view of the Writing Fellows' perspectives.

When asked about what makes this program most effective, many of the Writing Fellows noted that helping students build confidence in their ability to think and write makes this a valuable program. Writing Fellows also expressed their desire for the Writing Center to have its own physical space. Many noted the noise levels in the LAL, as well as the distractions and lack of privacy for students. This is a concern of mine also, and I hope that we can look at solving this problem in the near future.

Several Writing Fellows commented on the positive working relationship they experienced with the instructors of their fellowed classes. However, when dissatisfied with the relationship, it was usually because the instructor did not take the program seriously, or did not encourage his or her students to participate in the program. The Writing Fellows also reflected on their experiences as writing tutors and they overwhelmingly stated that the program made them feel like a part of the college and helped them improve academically and socially. In addition, all of the respondents thought the program should continue because of the service provided to students.

Below is a sampling of Writing Fellow comments. I have tried to provide insight into the program, relying on the feelings and thoughts the Writing Fellows expressed, whether positive or negative.

In what area do you think the WAC program is most effective?

"I think Writing Fellows address the higher order [thesis, organization, logic] problems most effectively. The mechanics and lower order problems require too much time to do much with in one appointment."

"Student confidence. I am tutoring an older student, and I can see his gains in confidence."

"Our personalities help tutees feel comfortable to come to the Writing Center. I think this is what makes our program very effective."

"I believe we are most effective working with our assigned fellowed class. We have a clear picture of what the instructor expects, get to take the papers home and thoroughly read them, and we get to write a concise report."

"I think it's applicable to each individual situation. Everyone comes in at a different level and we are prepared to handle them all (at least we should be after Advanced Composition)."

"Building confidence seems more effective because after this, anything is possible."

"I think the WAC program is effective in all areas. As Writing Fellows, we do not just assist students with certain areas of the writing process, we are there for support as well. I think it's very helpful to have students tutoring students because there is a common ground to build upon."

"I believe that this program really builds students' confidence. When 151 students come in an actually receive an approval or good feedback on their papers, I believe it makes doing other papers easier."

What one or two things would you do to improve the effectiveness or efficiency of the program? Please be specific.

"Tape a tutoring session to give them (new Writing Fellows) a better idea of what to do."

"More advertising about who should see a Writing Fellow, who we are, and what we do and don't do.

"To improve the effectiveness of the WAC program we should have our own room. This would put the meeting on a more personal level."

"A quiet environment. There is so much going on in the LAL that it can get pretty loud."

"Computers would improve the program. Most students write papers on computers and they could bring papers in on a disk to work on."

"Have more instructors require students to see a Writing Fellow."

"I do not think students should be required to see a Writing Fellow. . . . Sometimes when students must see a Writing Fellow, their attitudes are not great."

"We need our own space. Too much chatter. Concentration is hindered and most important, students are intimidated when asked to read with other people listening around them."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How do you feel about the working relationship you have with the instructor of your fellowed class?

"It's comfortable. A very good experience."

"We had great communication throughout the process. The contact is just right."

"Our relationship was positive, but I don't believe I met her expectations."

"One instructor is positive and believes in the program. The other is fairly neutral and it is hard to know if I am doing what he want or expects."

"He is great to work for. He supported me and program 100%."

What is your impression of the physical environment of the Writing Center; and given the fact that we are housed in the LAL, what improvements could we make?

"The distractions are awful. I'd like to see some partitions similar to the counselors' cubicles.

"It's too bad we don't have a separate area for the Writing Center. It gets too noisy when we are tying to concentrate on a tutee's paper."

"Perhaps we have outgrown the LAL. Due to the popularity and traffic, we probably could use a separate space of our own."

"Being part of the LAL shows the college services working as a whole. But we need more space, more privacy. Students hate reading their work aloud with others listening."

"It is not writer friendly. Move and decorate the new Writing Center in a more positive way."

Please reflect on your experience as a Writing Fellow. Give me your impression of the program; but more importantly, tell me how being a Writing Fellow has influenced you as a student or person.

"I believe the program is excellent for all students. Being a Writing Fellow has influenced me to understand how important writing is to my future."

"I have gained confidence in my writing and my speaking abilities. I feel the Writing Fellow experience has played a role in recent awards that I have won. I will always be grateful for that."

"Being involved in the Writing Fellow program has made me a better student in the area of interpreting information. I find myself really picking apart material. It has also influenced my personality—more confidence."

"Being a Writing Fellow is more than sitting in the Center for 2 hours a week. It's being a model student--one who encourages others. It's working with instructors on a higher level. It is being respectful. It's making friends and having good times. It is a total experience."

"Being a Writing Fellow has made me more aware of the need for critical thinking skills."

"Not only has being a Writing Fellow made me a better writer, it has also brought me closer to the college faculty and students. I know most students benefit from the sessions (comfortable environment and useful suggestions). I am thankful to have been a part of the program and I'm going to miss it."

"I feel a part of MCCC. It's not just a college institution. This program let me feel like a part of the college."

"I cannot express enough how this program has helped me as a student and a person."

"I think it's been a great experience. I've learned much more about writing and working with people."

Should this program continue at MCCC? Why or why not?

"Absolutely! I can't imagine why a school would ever prefer mediocre work to excellent work. I sincerely believe my own papers and critical thinking have greatly improved because of this program."

"Obviously it should continue. Our students have an advantage when they transfer to other institutions because of this program."

"I think the WAC program is the most productive and well known program on campus."

"Yes! The program is very effective. Students enjoy the one-on-one suggestions."

"Yes! With all the writing that is assigned on campus, it is important for students to have this service. Otherwise, they would be left on their own to find the help they need to be better writers."

"Absolutely! Like you mentioned at the last meeting. Some 8,000 conferences in the last four years have probably helped those students very much. It's one of the best programs at the college."

"It may be hard to measure the short term effectiveness of the program, but those fellows and students who participate in the program create and contribute to a family style experience that cannot be duplicated anywhere else. I love my stay here."

Having discussed the problem of students showing up at Eastern Michigan without writing skills with my professors there, I have discovered that the students from MCCC tend to have superior writing skills when compared to the average university student."

"Yes. Being there to help students shows how much we care. The Writing Fellow program is such a good idea!"

IX. WAC Evaluation by Faculty

As in other years, I surveyed the participating faculty for their thoughts on the success of the WAC program. Twenty-one faculty members responded to the survey, and their responses provide insight into the strengths and weaknesses of our program. Because faculty play a crucial role in the Writing Fellow program, it is imperative to use their comments for constructive change and program development.

The evaluation questions have remained the same over the last two years and ask the faculty to examine how they use the WAC program as well as the services we provide. Faculty seem to use the WAC program in several ways. While some faculty make tutoring mandatory for all students; some provide a reward, such as bonus points, for doing so; and others allow students to decide for themselves. While we continue to recommend mandatory visits to the Writing Center for students, we do recognize different approaches appeal to different instructors. Yet, the evidence provided by instructors seems to suggest that voluntary attendance for first visits does not work well. Left on their own, students seem to procrastinate about making appointments for a writing conference as much as they do about writing the paper; therefore, they never learn how helpful a writing conference can be.

The first two questions in the survey examined the success or failure of each approach—mandatory or voluntary. The answers in this year's report are not conclusive, but the pattern of success for mandatory attendance seems to correlate to the lack of success for voluntary attendance; meanwhile, grade incentives seem to fall somewhere in the middle –inconsistent attendance by students. A sampling of faculty responses follow below.

I continued to develop a statistical description of responses to questions about how faculty communicate the Writing Center to their students, why they use the Writing Center, and how well they think we are doing our job. These statistics follow the anecdotal comments.

The majority of respondents found that the Writing Center is open for an adequate number of hours. Those who did not, cited evening hours as lacking. A majority of respondents also found Writing Fellows to be knowledgeable and expressed that their students seemed more confident about writing and developed improved attitudes toward writing after a conference. In addition, the respondents found the communication among Writing Fellows, the program coordinator, and faculty to be adequate.

From all indicators, we continue to have strong support from faculty who use the program.

Faculty Comments:

If you found your approach (voluntary, mandatory, grade incentive) successful, please explain why it worked for your course(s).

"To extent students used the program, grades were greatly improved. Approach would be more successful only if was mandatory. I would not do that because students need to be responsible for their own preparation after providing them with the opportunity." (voluntary)

"The students knew it was expected and nearly all managed to find the time to go to the LAL [Writing Center]." (mandatory)

"Forces writers to re-think their writing and honestly fulfill the promises made in their thesis." (mandatory)

"I didn't 'waffle' on my expectations. If I didn't see the WF report attached to the papers, I deducted points. No questions. I received no complaints." (grade incentive)

"Nearly all attended their session and showed progress." (mandatory)

"Those students who had the time and thought it would help them did go. Those who did not want to go didn't. I could tell the difference in their papers and may make it mandatory or grade incentive in the future." (voluntary)

If you did not find it successful, how would you change your approach next time? Why?

"I should have made it mandatory for students to work with a Writing Fellow. For the students who worked with [the Writing Fellow], their was an immediate improvement in their respective writing. [The Writing Fellow] had much to offer, I regret some students who could have benefited chose not to do so." (voluntary)

"Next time I will offer a substantial point incentive." (voluntary)

"Students seemed to assume that because it wasn't mandatory they didn't actually have to meet with a Writing Fellow. Those who did presented much better papers." (voluntary)

Will you describe one or two ways the program met your expectations.

"I wanted my group to get another opinion of their writing—almost all of my group write well, so I was fortunate here. I also wanted the group to learn about resources available to them at MCCC."

"Students using WF assistance receive very high grades on papers."

"It helps the students realize how important the professor considers the assignment. I get no last-minute efforts when all do two drafts."

"Students who availed themselves of the assistance quickly caught concepts I didn't have the time to address."

"Work was done in a timely fashion. I honestly believe the writing improved from first draft to the final one."

Will you describe one or two ways the program did not meet your expectations.

"Evening students that work find it difficult to meet with a Writing Fellow."

"Since all students did not have the same due date, it was a little difficult getting the papers to the Writing Fellow."

Do you have one suggestion to improve the program?

"Program works well. Student need to take this initiative after told that this assistance is available."

"I like the Writing Fellow to meet the class in the classroom to explain and schedule appointments."

"Would love to start working earlier in the semester with the Writing Fellow. I know it takes time to make the assignments, but it sure would be great to start in the first week or two."

"I'm not sure how you would do this, but is there a way to make 'setting an appointment' less daunting?"

"Since my assignments are on file in the Writing Center, it would be beneficial if new Writing Fellows looked through the material prior to meeting with me at the start of the semester."

"I would like to see a better way at getting the papers to the Writing Fellow and to make sure students and Writing Fellows agree on meeting times."

Faculty Evaluation Questionnaire Statistics

The total number of respondents was 21. Percentages indicated as 1% may actually be less.

What approach did you take in telling your students about the Writing Fellow assigned to your course?

Voluntary:	24%
Mandatory:	52%
Grade Incentive Provided:	24%

Did you find your approach successful?

Yes:	86%
No:	14%

Do you plan to participate in the Writing Fellow program again?

Yes:	95%
Next Semester:	76%
Future Semesters:	20%
No:	4% (respondents retiring)

How do you recommend the Writing Center to your students?

I request a tutor make a presentation:	85%
I tell my class(es) about the Writing Center:	47%
I recommend the Writing Center in my syllabus:	14%
Other:	4%

Why do you recommend the Writing Center to your students?

To start an assignment:	38%
To help with organization:	76%
To help with structure:	81%
To help with developing ideas:	67%
To help with grammar and spelling:	71%
To ensure they are following directions:	81%
Other (please specify) _____	9%

The number of hours and the times of day that the Writing Center is open is adequate.

Strongly Agree 24% Agree 43% No Opinion 29% Disagree 04% Strongly Disagree 0%

The Writing Fellows seem knowledgeable about writing and the writing process.

Strongly Agree 38% Agree 48% No Opinion 14% Disagree 0% Strongly Disagree 0%

My students seem more confident about writing as a result of working with a Writing Fellow.

Strongly Agree 38% Agree 33% No Opinion 29% Disagree 0% Strongly Disagree 0%

My students seem to have developed a more positive attitude toward writing as a result of working with a Writing Fellow.

Strongly Agree 29% Agree 38% No Opinion 33% Disagree 0% Strongly Disagree 0%

The overall communication among the program coordinator, Writing Fellow(s), students, and instructor was adequate.

Strongly Agree 57% Agree 24% No Opinion 19% Disagree 0% Strongly Disagree 0%

X. WAC Budget Report

Below is the budget report indicating total cost (excluding the Coordinators salary) for the years 1997-1998. Our goal continues to be to keep the program costs under $20,000, and to this date we have been successful. However, with increases in tuition (scholarships), the cost will rise over the next several years.

Currently each Novice Writing Fellow receives a scholarship that pays for the required Advanced Composition course (3 credit hours), and a $100.00 voucher to be used at the MCCC bookstore. Each Senior Writing Fellow receives a scholarship that pays for any 3 credit hour course (for credit or audit) and a $150.00 voucher to be used at the MCCC bookstore. Out-of-county students increased the budget by $72.00 per each out of county student. Three Writing Fellows were out of county during fall 1997 semester.

The scholarship program for WAC students has worked well since its inception in 1995-1996. We have realized a reasonable growth in cost, while maintaining a consistent number of Writing Fellows to effectively meet program goals. In addition, we have been able to staff a limited spring semester WAC program without breaking our budget ceiling. Our current recommendation is to continue the scholarship program, but also explore other budgeting options that might be advantageous to students and the college.

Rate: (1997-1998)	Senior WF ($288.00)	Novice WF ($238.00)
	Number of WFs & Cost	Number of WFs & Cost
Fall 1997	15 ($4,320.00)	14 ($3,332.00)
(out of county)	3 ($1,098.00)	
Winter 1998	15 ($4,320.00)	18 ($4,284.00)
Spring 1998	4 (%1,152.00)	

*Total 1997-1998 $18,872.00

Appendix.....

1. Institutional Project Grant: A Report on Research into Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Projects. (1987). Survey reprinted with permission from John Holladay, Monroe County Community College.

VII. THE SURVEY: FACULTY VIEWS OF STUDENT WRITING AT MONROE COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE (DETAILS OF THE SURVEY)

1. Do your students have consistent, serious writing problems in the following areas? (Most did not respond in every category–indicating that some categories do not apply to the types of writing done by their students.)

CATEGORY	YES	SOMETIMES	NO
Organization	30	13	1
Narrowing a Topic	23	14	3
Supporting an Idea	28	13	2
Sense of Purpose	22	15	4
Awareness of Audience	16	11	8
Tone	11	13	7
Originality	16	15	6
Coherence	23	15	3
Diction	15	12	5
Paragraph Structure	25	12	4
Sentence Construction	25	14	2
Grammar	31	12	1
Usage	19	18	2
Transitions	20	10	5
Revising	14	15	8
Research Skills	22	14	4
Punctuation	25	13	1
Spelling	31	12	1
Proofreading	26	12	1
Vocabulary	25	15	2

II. Indicate the type of writing assignments your students are required to complete.

WRITING ASSIGNMENT	REGULARLY	SOMETIMES	NEVER
Essay Exams	8	20	21
Article Reviews	5	20	24
Expository Essays	7	4	38
Lab Reports	15	7	27
Research Papers	12	16	21
Business Reports	2	13	34
Letters	3	14	32
Critical/Analytical Essays	5	10	34
Outlines	16	22	11
Study Questions	10	20	19
Observation Logs	6	11	32
Journals	4	9	36
Creative Writing	2	6	41
Argumentative Essays	5	4	40

(A few faculty listed other categories more specifically related to their disciplines: lab notebooks, position papers, case studies, patient care studies and plans, lesson plans, tech. documentation, and micro-themes.)

III. Faculty were asked to write brief answers to the following questions.
(Not all respondents replied to every question.)

Do you feel that a significant number of your students are seriously handicapped by deficient writing skills?

40 Replied Yes
3 Replied No
6 Made No Comment

Other comments included the following:

"About 25% do."

"They are handicapped, but not seriously."

"In my experience the deficiencies are infrequent and not serious (among nursing students)."

"Yes and No--a lack of ability to communicate ideas coherently is a serious handicap for a significant number. On the other hand many have problems with grammar, structure, etc. but are able to get a point across--this is not as big a problem, in my view."

"They are deficient until they are forced to write appropriately."

"Yes, but they do little writing in the typical welding class."

"Not a significant number, but many do have minor difficulties."

"Yes, writing skills are as important to technology students as they are to other students."

"I would say that only about 20% can communicate effectively and accurately through writing."

"My guess is that at least one-third are handicapped by deficient writing skills."

"Yes--the students tend to write as they speak, and I find their speech leaves much to be desired."

"Yes! The composition of a routine letter of application is a monumental task for most students."

If your students' writing is deficient, what do you feel our community college should do to help improve writing?

Require two semesters of English Composition:

31 Replied Yes
5 Replied No
13 Made No Comment

Other comments included:

"One semester should be enough--maybe it should be made more effective."

"The student should have to pass the course, not just take it."

"Absolutely, although this is not the sole solution."

"Probably the best solution is to have all classes require more writing assignments."

"It would be a step in the right direction. Two years is probably not enough time, but it is a start."

"I think we are too stuck on 'term' papers of great length and the use of the style manual. We should demand that a student should be able to write many (12) short papers (1-2 pages) on textbook material or some topic. Quality not quantity."

"Not enough room in the schedule."

"Yes, but focus is important."

"Yes, as a minimum."

"To be sure. Yes, and stress basic grammar."

"Yes, with pre-tests and post-tests."

"No. The relevance of this to certain programs is questionable."

"No. I'm afraid that most tech students do not react favorably to the requirement of one semester. Our efforts are better spent in winning their respect and support for one semester."

"Yes. No question, it is needed."

"Screen out the deficient through testing and cut down class size to better individualize instruction."

Have faculty place more emphasis on writing competency in all areas of the curriculum:

27 Replied Yes
9 Replied No
13 Made No Comment

Other comments included:

"I have many projects to grade and read--I would not see this as my major objective."

"Yes, if writing competency is defined as ability to communicate in writing versus grammar, etc."

"This should be done as much as is appropriate to the course."

"Yes! This would help a great deal."

"When practical, yes. However, areas like math and physics do not necessarily lend themselves to this approach."

"I can't get them to read before lecture time."

"There isn't time to devote to this."

"Who will be responsible for this emphasis?"

"In many technical classes there is not time to worry about writing deficiencies."

"Considering the time demands that writing activities make on both students and faculty, this may be difficult to achieve in many of the curricula: in terms of time demands made on students, the Respiratory Therapy program is already as full as an egg."

"We should have more required courses that require writing."

"In order for students to sense the necessity for writing competency, each teacher could create written assignments. However, some of us may not be as competent in judging good writing skills."

"In some areas it is not important. When grammar is emphasized at the expense of creative ideas, I feel we do a disservice to our students."

"Yes, but how to best do it in each of our respective areas? There's the question."

"May help emphasize the universal importance of written communication. May help dispel the student notion, 'I don't need to worry about grammar, spelling, etc. This isn't an English class.'"

Have the college require remedial writing courses for-all students who demonstrate serious writing deficiencies on the ASSET tests:

32 Replied Yes
11 Replied No
6 Made No Reply

Other comments included:

"This seems the best option. Students can be identified early and corrective measures taken."

"We should provide such courses and very strongly suggest enrollment."

"Not likely .,part-time, certificate, etc . . . . wouldn't go for this."

"Not required, but to have it available would be useful."

"Yes. Better yet remedial-reading courses."

"Yes, if the test is accurate."

"Oh! What a fine can of worms that would be."

"Uncertain . . . My experience indicates that many students are too 'sloppy' minded to follow directions."

"No. Students are already scared witless of English. Threatening them with remedial courses will drive them away in herds."

"I'm not sure remedial courses work. The data does not indicate they work."

"This would be a good place to start. Such action would demonstrate institutional recognition of the importance of written communication in all disciplines."

"Yes. There is a basic level that a college student should attain to be functional and representative of one's education."

Create opportunities for faculty dialogue across the curriculum so that we may explore better ways of reinforcing writing skills in all disciplines.

21 Replied Yes
4 Replied No
24 Made No Reply

Other comments included:

"Certainly. Remember many faculty may feel threatened by this notion–we may expose our own weaknesses."

"Sounds good, but I have no particular suggestions."

"Only for those who request these 'opportunities.' "

"I don't think writing skills can be reinforced in all disciplines and still allow achievement in other areas to be measured accurately."

"It seems reasonable that the faculty could pool our ideas and reinforce writing skills."

"Rather as a recommendation–a help for those who want it, so they can see how they are doing."

"Not necessary."

"Absolutely."

"Only good if we agree on some grading values."

Have the college require a writing-proficiency exam as a graduation requirement:

10 Replied Yes
17 Replied No
22 Made No Reply

other comments included:

"No. Improved writing skills are desirable but not absolutely necessary."

"This is an important skill that every college graduate should be able to demonstrate."

"This could prove embarrassing."

"A reading proficiency exam."

"Would this be necessary if the above changes are made?"

"Many graduates couldn't pass my daughter's 4th grade class."

"Not a bad idea, but what precedent is there for this particular approach?"

"I would not want to see us go out of business."

"I don't feel this is necessary if the student has passed his classes."

"No. This just begs the question, I think. The college courses must be set up so that if a student cannot write competently, then he or she cannot graduate because of bad grades."

"No. As a threat with negative results. However, a line on the transcript certifying that the graduate has passed a voluntary writing-proficiency exam would put it in a positive light."

"No. This belongs within the coursework and at the admittance stage."

Other things I think we could do to improve our students' writing:

"Could we co-ordinate assignments within the divisions. For example, if an instructor gives essay exams, should we teach a block on how t o write an essay answer? If an instructor assigns a book review, should we develop that as a writing block?"

"Every faculty member must take an interest in student writing skills."

"Hire another full-time writing instructor."

"Attempt to convince students in all MCCC classes that writing skills will be crucial to success in the working world."

"Attempt to include writing assignments which offer direct application to the working world."

"The content of English 101 and 102 (including current tests, assignment sheets, texts, outlines, etc.) should be reviewed periodically by members of Tech and Business Divisions."

"This is a serious problem. All faculty members need to grade all papers with a critical eye to writing skills."

"We need to show them how vital the skills are in the real world of the job market, as well as to show them, even more importantly, that competence in language is necessary for human growth and prosperity in the broadest senses."

"First improve faculty and administrators' skills."

"Start a Writing Center and make it available to all students in all courses."

"Help students learn how to study first, then work on writing skills."

"Perhaps editors and helpers in the LAL."

"Establish a standardized system of essay exam evaluation. Promote use of LAL word processing facilities. Investigate the practicality of implementing additional computer aids such as spell checking, grammar evaluating, and on-line thesaurus/dictionary programs."

"I would favor more emphasis on writing skills through additional English composition classes, remedial courses and writing proficiency requirements for graduation. I do not think a student should be further penalized for writing deficiencies in classes such as math and computer programming."

"All students must take class notes and outline text material. They also must read the text. Students must think, reason, speak, write, read, etc. if they are unable to do any of these tasks, they are unable to learn. All of these areas are interrelated. No one is the key. Taking an objective test requires the above skills and many of my students are unable to do that."

"The learning assistance lab is the best approach that is currently available."

"Require improved penmanship."

"Do we employ remedial reading/writing specialists on campus?"

"Require a technical writing course in the technology division."

"One caution I would raise is that we be careful not to operate on the basis of human perfectability. Some people will never be able to write well--no matter what we do or how hard they try."

"Individual counseling of students to make them aware of their problems and corrective actions suggested to them have been productive."

"Require more formal writing in all areas of instruction. Faculty might need staff development in this area. I can write well and can recognize when a student does not. However, I do not have the skills to help them with their problem."

"Have college representative discuss issues with elementary and secondary schools' administrators and teachers."

Would you support attempts to foster a campus-wide emphasis on improving writing skills across the curriculum?

27 Replied Yes
3 Replied No
19 Made No Reply

Other comments included:

"It depends on how it would be implemented."

"I am deeply cynical about its coming to anything. If students do not enter the college with a strong sense of the vital importance of effective writing and speaking, I doubt that many of them will look upon writing as more than a temporary nuisance imposed by a gang of old curmudgeon professors in order to cut into students' 'fun time.'"

"I personally do not emphasize grammar, only ideas. So if this meant harsh policing with an emphasis on grammar, I would say no. If it meant encouraging students to take writing seriously, I would say yes."

"Yes. I would be willing to learn to be a better writer myself in addition to helping the students."

"Writing skills need to be included in the grading process for all courses--not just in composition courses."

"Not a campus-wide effort. But an effort coordinated by the English Department and perhaps involving a few other departments."

"Depends . . . I would have to know what 'support' means."

"I would enjoy a campus-wide effort in other areas of literacy: statistics, computers."

"I would not fight against one, but I will not require papers."